

## **Remarks**

The Notice of Non-Responsive Amendment mailed on May 7, 2009 has been reviewed. In compliance with 37 C.F.R. 121, Applicants submit omitted sections for the Response submitted on February 20, 2009 in response to the prior Non-Final office action mailed May 29, 2008. In particular, in compliance with 37 CFR 1.111(b), Applicants submit claim amendments and arguments to completely address the rejections of claims 1, 8, 45, 70, 74, 85-88, 102, 108, 111, 116, and 129 under 35 USC. 112, second paragraph in the prior Non-Final office action.

### **Claim Rejections –35 USC § 112**

Claims 1, 8, 45, 70, 74, 85-88, 102, 108, 111, 116, and 129 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, 45, 70, 74, 85-88, 102, 108, 111, 116, and 129 as suggested where required.

For example, currently amended claims 1, 45, and 102 now recite “at least partially a requested media.”

Regarding claim 8, Applicants point out that claim 7 provides antecedent basis for “the session” in claim 8. In particular, claim 7, recites in part, “a viewing event for a session.”

Previously presented claim 70 now recites “stream routing processor” instead of “stream processor.”

Previously presented claim 74 now recites “the requested media” instead of “the media.”

Previously presented claim 85 now recites “configured transmit from at least one member” instead of “configured transmit from the system at least one member.”

Previously presented claim 86 now recites “when the log data system is configured to transmit from the signaling logs” and amended claims 87 and 88 now depend from claim 86.

Previously presented claim 108 now recites “the determining comprises” instead of “the determining step comprises” and recites “a stream routing processor” instead of “the stream routing processor.”

Previously presented claim 111 now depends from claim 109 and, thus, there is sufficient antecedent basis “the address.”

Currently amended claim 116 now recites “the requested media being streamed” instead of “the requested media streaming.”

Previously presented claim 129 now recites “each information block ” instead of “the information block.”

Based on the foregoing and the Remarks submitted in the previous Response submitted December 4, 2008, it is submitted that the Applicants’ claims 1-102 and 107-134 are patentable over the references of record. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance is solicited.

Applicants’ attorney welcomes the opportunity to discuss the case with the Examiner in the event that there are any questions or comments regarding the response or the application.

This is intended to be a complete response to the Examiner’s Office action mailed on May 7, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,

POLSINELLI SHUGHART PC



---

Robert O. Enyard, Jr., Reg. No. 57,780  
100 South Fourth Street, Suite 1100  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102  
Tel: (314) 889-8000  
Fax: (314) 231-1776  
Attorney for Applicants